

Ford	Markey	Roybal-Allard
Frank (MA)	Martinez	Rush
Frost	Mascara	Sabo
Gejdenson	Matsui	Sanchez
Gephardt	McCarthy (MO)	Sanders
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Sandlin
Gordon	McDermott	Sawyer
Green (TX)	McGovern	Schaffer
Gutierrez	McKinney	Schakowsky
Hall (OH)	McNulty	Scott
Hall (TX)	Meehan	Serrano
Hastings (FL)	Meek (FL)	Sherman
Hill (IN)	Meeks (NY)	Shows
Hilliard	Menendez	Sisisky
Hinchey	Millender	Skelton
Hinojosa	McDonald	Slaughter
Hoeffel	Miller, George	Smith (WA)
Holden	Minge	Snyder
Holt	Mink	Spratt
Hooley	Moakley	Stabenow
Hoyer	Mollohan	Stark
Inslee	Moore	Stenholm
Jackson (IL)	Moran (VA)	Strickland
Jackson-Lee	Morella	Stupak
(TX)	Nadler	Tancredo
Jefferson	Napolitano	Tanner
John	Neal	Tauscher
Johnson, E. B.	Oberstar	Taylor (MS)
Jones (OH)	Obey	Thompson (CA)
Kanjorski	Olver	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Ortiz	Thurman
Kennedy	Owens	Tierney
Kildee	Pallone	Towns
Kind (WI)	Pascarell	Turner
Klecza	Pastor	Udall (CO)
Klink	Paul	Udall (NM)
Kucinich	Payne	Velazquez
LaFalce	Pelosi	Vento
Lampson	Peterson (MN)	Visclosky
Lantos	Phelps	Waters
Larson	Pickett	Watt (NC)
Lee	Pomeroy	Waxman
Levin	Price (NC)	Weiner
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Wexler
Lipinski	Reyes	Weygand
Lofgren	Rivers	Woolsey
Lowey	Rodriguez	Wu
Luther	Roemer	Wynn
Maloney (CT)	Rothman	

NOT VOTING—8

Bereuter	Maloney (NY)	Scarborough
Hulshof	Murtha	Weldon (PA)
Kilpatrick	Rahall	

□ 1819

Mr. PASCARELL and Mr. BERMAN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. KILPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, due to official business in the 15th Congressional District of Michigan, I was unable to record my votes for rollcall nos. 559, 560, 561, and 562 considered today. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye" on rollcall No. 559, an amendment offered by Mr. MARK UDALL to H.R. 2389, the County Schools Funding Revitalization Act, "no" on rollcall No. 560, final passage of H.R. 2389, "no" on rollcall No. 561, H.Res. 353, providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, and "no" on rollcall No. 562, H.R. 3194, District of Columbia Appropriations Act for FY 2000.

SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Sherman Williams, one of his secretaries.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 872

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 872. My name was added by mistake instead of that of my colleague, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS).

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PEASE). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1300

Mr. WEINER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 1300.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT REGARDING BILLS TO BE CONSIDERED UNDER SUSPENSION OF THE RULES ON TOMORROW

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 353, I rise to announce the following suspensions to be considered tomorrow:

H. Con. Res. 214; and
H.R. 1693.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 2891

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my name as a cosponsor of H.R. 2891.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

AGREEMENT FOR COOPERATION BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND AUSTRALIA CONCERNING TECHNOLOGY FOR SEPARATION OF ISOTOPIES OF URANIUM BY LASER EXCITATION—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, without objection, referred to the Committee on International Relations:

To the Congress of the United States:

I am pleased to transmit to the Congress, pursuant to sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (42 U.S.C. 2153(b), (d)), the text of a proposed Agreement for Cooperation Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Technology for the Separation of Isotopes of Uranium by Laser Excitation,

with accompanying annexes and agreed minute. I am also pleased to transmit my written approval, authorization, and determination concerning the Agreement, and an unclassified Nuclear Proliferation Assessment Statement (NPAS) concerning the Agreement. (In accordance with section 123 of the Act, as amended by title XII of the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act of 1998 (Public Law 105-277), a classified annex to the NPAS, prepared by the Secretary of State in consultation with the Director of Central Intelligence, summarizing relevant classified information, will be submitted to the Congress separately.) The joint memorandum submitted to me by the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Energy, which includes a summary of the provisions of the Agreement and the views of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, is also enclosed.

A U.S. company and an Australian company have entered into a contract jointly to develop and evaluate the commercial potential of a particular uranium enrichment process (known as the "SILEX" process) invented by the Australian company. If the commercial viability of the process is demonstrated, the U.S. company may adopt it to enrich uranium for sale to U.S. and foreign utilities for use as reactor fuel.

Research on and development of the new enrichment process may require transfer from the United States to Australia of technology controlled by the United States as sensitive nuclear technology or Restricted Data. Australia exercises similar controls on the transfer of such technology outside Australia. There is currently in force an Agreement Between the United States of America and Australia Concerning Peaceful Uses of Nuclear Energy, signed at Canberra July 5, 1979 (the "1979 Agreement"). However, the 1979 Agreement does not permit transfers of sensitive nuclear technology and Restricted Data between the parties unless specifically provided for by an amendment or by a separate agreement.

Accordingly, the United States and Australia have negotiated, as a complement to the 1979 Agreement, a specialized agreement for peaceful nuclear cooperation to provide the necessary legal basis for transfers of the relevant technology between the two countries for peaceful purposes.

The proposed Agreement provides for cooperation between the parties and authorized persons within their respective jurisdictions in research on and development of the SILEX process (the particular process for the separation of isotopes of uranium by laser excitation). The Agreement permits the transfer for peaceful purposes from Australia to the United States and from the United States to Australia, subject to the nonproliferation conditions and controls set forth in the

Agreement of Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear technology, sensitive nuclear facilities, and major critical components of such facilities, to the extent that these relate to the SILEX technology.

The nonproliferation conditions and controls required by the Agreement are the standard conditions and controls required by section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended by the Nuclear Non-Proliferation Act of 1978 (NNPA), for all new U.S. agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation. These include safeguards, a guarantee of no explosive or military use, a guarantee of adequate physical protection, and rights to approve re-transfers, enrichment, reprocessing, other alterations in form or content, and storage. The Agreement contains additional detailed provisions for the protection of sensitive nuclear technology, Restricted Data, sensitive nuclear facilities, and major critical components of such facilities transferred pursuant to it.

Material, facilities, and technology subject to the Agreement may not be used to produce highly enriched uranium without further agreement of the parties.

The Agreement also provides that cooperation under it within the territory of Australia will be limited to research on and development of SILEX technology, and will not be for the purpose of constructing a uranium enrichment facility in Australia unless provided for by an amendment to the Agreement. The United States would treat any such amendment as a new agreement pursuant to section 123 of the Atomic Energy Act, including the requirement for congressional review.

Australia is in the forefront of nations supporting international efforts to prevent the spread of nuclear weapons to additional countries. It is a party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT) and has an agreement with the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) for the application of full-scope safeguards to its nuclear program. It subscribes to the Nuclear Supplier Group (NSG) Guidelines, which set forth standards for the responsible export of nuclear commodities for peaceful use, and to the Zangger (NPT Exporters) Committee Guidelines, which oblige members to require the application of IAEA safeguards on nuclear exports to nonnuclear weapon states. In addition, Australia is a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, whereby it has agreed to apply international standards of physical protection to the storage and transport of nuclear material under its jurisdiction or control.

The proposed Agreement with Australia has been negotiated in accordance with the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and other applicable law. In my judgment, it meets all statutory requirements and will advance the nonproliferation, foreign policy, and commercial interests of the United States.

A consideration in interagency deliberations on the Agreement was the potential consequences of the Agreement for U.S. military needs. If SILEX technology is successfully developed and becomes operational, then all material produced by and through this technology would be precluded from use in the U.S. nuclear weapons and naval nuclear propulsion programs. Furthermore, all other military uses of this material, such as tritium production and material testing, would also not be possible because of the assurances given to the Government of Australia. Yet, to ensure the enduring ability of the United States to meet its common defense and security needs, the United States must maintain its military nuclear capabilities. Recognizing this requirement and the restrictions being placed on the SILEX technology, the Department of Energy will monitor closely the development of SILEX but ensure that alternative uranium enrichment technologies are available to meet the requirements for national security.

I have considered the views and recommendations of the interested agencies in reviewing the proposed Agreement and have determined that its performance will promote, and will not constitute an unreasonable risk to, the common defense and security. Accordingly, I have approved the Agreement and authorized its execution and urge that the Congress give it favorable consideration.

Because this Agreement meets all applicable requirements of the Atomic Energy Act, as amended, for agreements for peaceful nuclear cooperation, I am transmitting it to the Congress without exempting it from any requirement contained in section 123 a. of that Act. This transmission shall constitute a submittal for purposes of both sections 123 b. and 123 d. of the Atomic Energy Act. My Administration is prepared to begin immediately the consultations with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and House International Relations Committee as provided in section 123 b. Upon completion of the 30-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 b., the 60-day continuous session period provided for in section 123 d. shall commence.

WILLIAM J. CLINTON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, November 3, 1999.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2000—VETO MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 106-154)

The Speaker pro tempore laid before the House the following veto message from the President of the United States:

To the House of Representatives:

I am returning herewith without my approval H.R. 3064, the FY 2000 District of Columbia and Departments of Labor,

Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies appropriations bill.

I am vetoing H.R. 3064 because the bill, including the offsets section, is deeply flawed. It includes a misguided 0.97 percent across-the-board reduction that will hurt everything from national defense to education and environmental programs. The legislation also contains crippling cuts in key education, labor, and health priorities and undermines our capacity to manage these programs effectively. The enrolled bill delays the availability of \$10.9 billion for the National Institutes of Health, the Centers for Disease Control, and other important health and social services programs, resulting in delays in important medical research and health services to low-income Americans. The bill is clearly unacceptable. I have submitted a budget that would fund these priorities without spending the Social Security surplus, and I am committed to working with the Congress to identify acceptable offsets for additional spending for programs that are important to all Americans.

The bill also fails to fulfill the bipartisan commitment to raise student achievement by authorizing and financing class size reduction. It does not guarantee any continued funding for the 29,000 teachers hired with FY 1999 funds, or the additional 8,000 teachers to be hired under my FY 2000 proposal. Moreover, the bill language turns the program into a virtual block grant that could be spent on vouchers and other unspecified activities. In addition, the bill fails to fund my proposed investments in teacher quality by not funding Troops to Teachers (\$18 million) and by cutting \$35 million from my request for Teacher Quality Enhancement Grants. These programs would bring more highly qualified teachers into the schools, especially in high-poverty, high-need school districts.

The bill cuts \$189 million from my request for Title I Education for the Disadvantaged, resulting in 300,000 fewer children in low-income communities receiving needed services. The bill also fails to improve accountability or help States turn around the lowest-performing schools because it does not include my proposal to set aside 2.5 percent for these purposes. Additionally, the bill provides only \$300 million for 21st Century Community Learning Centers, only half my \$600 million request. At this level, the conference report would deny afterschool services to more than 400,000 students.

The bill provides only \$180 million for GEAR UP, \$60 million below my request, to help disadvantaged students prepare for college beginning in the seventh grade. This level would serve nearly 131,000 fewer low-income students. In addition, the bill does not adequately fund my Hispanic Education Agenda. It provides no funds for the Adult Education English as a Second Language/Civics Initiative to help